



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

dk

DN
09/222,833

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/222,833 12/30/98 OHASHI

T 1341.1025/JD

EXAMINER

WM02/1219

STAAS & HALSEY
JAMES D HALSEY
SUITE 500
700 ELEVENTH STREET N W
WASHINGTON DC 20001

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2176
DATE MAILED:

6
12/19/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

File Copy

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/222,833

Applicant(s)

OHASHI, TADASHI

Examiner

Cong-Lac Huynh

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 September 2000.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- 15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.

- 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 20) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 9/28/00 to the application filed on 12/30/98.
2. Claims 1-8 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, and 8 are independent claims.
3. The objection of the title as being too long has been withdrawn in view of the new title.
4. The objections of claims 1-7 as being included informalities have been withdrawn in view of the amendment.
5. The rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention has been withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Priority

1. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

2. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto et al. (US Pat No. 5,893,114, 4/6/99, filed 11/14/96) in view of Domen et al (US Pat No. 5,504,676, 4/2/96, filed 5/26/94).

Regarding independent claim 1, Hashimoto discloses:

- storing a plurality of documents (acquiring a document from a document management server and storing document in a database (col 2, lines 49-55))
- acquiring information from a device connected to the communication network (the document management server, the document database and the request relay means are connected through a communication network (col 2, lines 55-62; col 4, lines 20-22, 45-55))

Hashimoto does not explicitly disclose the determining of the conflict between the attribute information included in the document and the master information, and the rewriting of the attribute information when the conflict is determined.

Domen discloses:

- updating of the format and data once per several times of use (col 1, lines 7-14, 26-34; col 2, lines 15-21)
- storing of slip documents (col 5, lines 39-50)
- retrieving the appropriate information when the format definition is updated (col 15, lines 45-51; col 16, lines 8-14)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Domen into Hashimoto to have an apparatus for managing documents, connected to a communication network, so that the documents are stored and updated periodically. The fact that Domen shows retrieving data accordance to the retrieval condition as well as updating documents periodically when the format information is updated implies that the system checks the conflict between the old input format and the new input format. In other words, it implies the system checks the conflict between the document information and the master information.

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Domen discloses:

- said document is a document including the corporate organization code and the corporate organization name (the ordering slip includes the department name and the department code (col 6, lines 15-27, 29-34, 45-50; col 7, lines 62-67; col 8, lines 5-11)
- the determining section, the rewriting section and their purposes as discloses in claim 1 above

Domen does not explicitly disclose the cases of conflict when an organization code is included in a document but the combination of the organization code and the organization name is not included in the master information, or when the organization name is included in a document but the combination of the organization code and the organization name is not included in the master information. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have employed Domen and combined Domen into Hashimoto. The data including the department name and the department code, and format as taught by Domen, which may be the improper information during a period of time (that means there is a conflict between the information each document and the information in the master information), is updated (that means rewritten).

Regarding to claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Domen discloses that:

- the document mentioned is an object for distribution correlated to job information (col 1, lines 7-37)
- the retrieving of the department name corresponding to each ordering slip (col 6, lines 29-50)
- the rewriting of the content of documents when the combination of the organization code and the organization name retrieved does not coincide the combination of the organization code and the organization name included in the document (since the text data contents are stored in the file...the content received can be edited on the receiving computer (col 8, lines 28-34; col 14, lines 47-55; col 1, lines 26-34)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have employed Domen since Doment discloses ordering slips (as a document) distributed in the network so that a user can edit the information data retrieved when the data is improper.

Regarding claims 4-6, which are dependent on claims 1-3 respectively, Domen discloses the using of an electronic email to notify things to other work station (command is issued from a terminal .. the prepared form may be transmitted to other work station by an electronic mail (col 2, lines 31-34)). It is noted that Domen does not disclose the notification of changing of attribute information in the document to each department. However, the using of electronic email to notify things to other workstation motivates the notification of the changing of attribute information to each department through the communication network using department addresses.

Claim 7 is for a computer-readable medium for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Claim 8 is for a computer system for claim 1, and is rejected under the same rationale.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 9/28/00 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Domen does not disclose the checking conflict between the old input format and the new input format when updating the input format.

Examiner agrees. However, Domen does disclose searching the format definition information in each slip data and retrieving condition, and *retrieving desired data in accordance with the retrieving condition* in which the *retrieving condition may include a new format definition* (col 15, lines 45-50; col 16, lines 8-14). It implies that the system checks the conflict between the old format and the new format information before retrieving and rewriting the appropriate data.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is (703)-305-0432. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon, can be reached on (703) 308-5186. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 308-5403.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5403 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")


Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Application/Control Number: 09/222,833
Art Unit: 2176

Page 9

clh

12/7/00


HEATHER R. HERNDON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100